

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments were made to the specification to correct errors and to clarify the specification. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to the specification.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21 are pending in the present application. By this Response, claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 21 are amended and claim 2, 9, and 16 are canceled. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of canceled claims 2, 9, and 16. Claims 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 14, 17, 18, and 21 are amended to correct minor errors and for dependency in view of the cancellation of claims 2, 9, and 16. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Savla for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the April 27, 2006 telephone interview. During the interview, suggestions to amend the present application to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection were discussed. Examiner Savla suggested amendments that would overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection. Claim 8 is amended to recite "A computer program product in a computer readable recordable-type medium..." Examiner Savla stated these amendments would overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection. The substance of the interview is summarized in the remarks of sections that follow.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank Examiner Savla for indicating the subject matter of claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 allowable. By this response, claims 1, 8, and 15 are amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submits that claims 3-7, 10-14, and 17-21 are also allowable and the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Office rejects claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. By this response, claim 8 is amended to recite "A computer program product in a computer readable recordable-type medium..."

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 8 is statutory. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Office rejects claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 are amended for clarity by providing proper antecedent basis and to more clearly recite the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Therefore, the rejection of claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

V. Objection to Claims

The Office states that claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, the claims have been rewritten to overcome this objection.


VI. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the prior art of record and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE:

May 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Francis Lammes
Reg. No. 55,353
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Agent for Applicants